

In re: Appln No. 10/642,560

Amendment dated March 19, 2006

Reply to Office action of January 26, 2006

Remarks

Claims 1 - 23 were pending prior to the present amendment. Upon entry of the present amendment, Claims 2 and 23 are canceled, as the limitations of Claim 2 are now incorporated into the limitations of the independent Claim 1. Claims 3 - 22 are amended claims to correct for informalities and are now dependent on the modified Claim 1 incorporating the limitation of the prior allowable Claim 2. Claims 24 - 25 are new independent claims. Only three independent claims are pending and the total number of claims remains less than the 23 earlier pending, it is believed that no additional claim fees are required.

35 USC 112, para. 2; Claim Objections

The Examiner cited for Claim 23 the specific objection of including informalities. Where the Applicant has not traversed, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful examination that uncovered this error. Applicant has addressed this objection by amending the appropriate claim limitations.

Because the Examiner's objections have been overcome, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

35 USC 112; Claim Rejections

Claims 2 - 3, 5 - 11, 14, and 16 - 23 were rejected by the Examiner as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful examination that uncovered this error. Applicant has addressed this objection by amending the preamble to "enhanced nanocomposite". The preamble of Claims 3 - 22 has been corrected to address the rejection and further amended to eliminate vagueness and achieve better clarity of the claims.

Claim 7 was rejected due to insufficient antecedent basis within the independent claim referenced of the term "matrix". Claim 7 has been corrected to address the rejection and further amended to eliminate vagueness and achieve better clarity of the claims.

In re: Appln No. 10/642,560
Amendment dated March 19, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 26, 2006

Ogawa et al (JP 58-103565) Cannot be properly cited to render amended Claims 1, 4 - 6, 11 and 14 - 22 as being anticipated

Claims 1, 4 - 6, 11 and 14 - 22 were rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Ogawa et al JP 58-103565 (hereinafter '565). The Examiner contends that '565 teaches an electrically conductive paint comprising a coating and a sub-micron particle size to meet the limitations of Claims 1, 4 - 6, 11 and 14 - 22.

With respect to independent Claim 1 applicant has responded by incorporating the limiting language of Claim 2 as a new limitation of Claim 1 thus reflecting the absence of any reference by '565 to nanocomposite conductive medium. The Applicant submits the allowable Claim 2 into the now modified independent Claim 1 and dependent claims 3 - 22 to reflect the fundamental difference and importance of incorporating a conductive medium that is itself a nanocomposite.

Binnis et al (US 3,345,187) Cannot be properly cited to render amended Claims 1, 4 - 6, 11 and 14 - 22 as being anticipated

Claims 1, 4 - 6, 11 and 14 - 22 were rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Binnis et al US 3,345,187 (hereinafter '187). The Examiner contends that '187 teaches sub-micron coated metal precursor powders to meet the limitation of Claims 1, 4 - 6, 11 and 14 - 22. Lastly, '187 does not anticipate electrical conductivity as a differentiable feature due to the absence of copper, aluminum, beryllium, gold, or silver all of which are recognized as yielding superior electrical and thermal conductivity. The Applicant submits modified independent Claim 31 to reflect the fundamental difference and importance of reducing a coated powder precursor versus a non-coated powder precursor, and the elimination of the reference to electrical conductivity.

With respect to independent Claim 1 applicant has responded by incorporating the limiting language of Claim 2 as a new limitation of Claim 1 thus reflecting the absence of any reference by '187 to nanocomposite conductive medium. The Applicant submits the allowable

In re: Appln No. 10/642,560
Amendment dated March 19, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 26, 2006

Claim 2 into the now modified independent Claim 1 and dependent claims 3 - 22 to reflect the fundamental difference and importance of incorporating a conductive medium that is itself a nanocomposite.

Summary

Applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims have overcome the Examiner's objections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner require any further information or wish to discuss any aspect of this Response, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. It is believed that no fees are required for this filing.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Gurin

Michael H. Gurin
March 19, 2006

4132 Cove Lane
Unit A
Glenview, IL 60025
Tel. 847-962-6180
E-mail: mgurin@cognitek.com

BEST AVAILABLE COPY